

In re Application of: Efraim ATAD et al
Serial No.: 10/810,591
Filed: March 29, 2004
Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Amit K. Ray
Group Art Unit: 2623
Attorney Docket: 27615

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 14 are in this Application. Claims 1 – 14, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Amendments To The Claims

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out the invention and overcome the rejection based on Connelly.

Connelly teaches a head end system and method in which a broadcasting system using a telco network to provide the return channel. The television signal arrives from the receiver antenna and the viewer receives a picture on his television screen. A return channel via the user's telephone connection then provides the return link. It is noted that Connelly contains no suggestion that the return channel goes via the user's television receiver, meaning his rooftop antenna arrangement. Certainly the rooftop antenna arrangements do not form relay nodes of a terrestrial network that provides the return channel.

Claim 1 has been amended to refer to the *external* user installation as forming a relay node of the terrestrial network through which the return channel is provided. Using such a construction the television provider is able to provide interactivity without having to build new infrastructure or to be dependent on anyone else's infrastructure.

There is no suggestion in Connelly as to any way of the television provider being able to supply his customers with a return channel without either having to build infrastructure or have to be dependent on another body such as the Telco.

Although Connelly clearly states that the network 113 could be a WAN, Connelly fails to teach or suggest that the external receiver installation of the user

In re Application of: Efraim ATAD et al
Serial No.: 10/810,591
Filed: March 29, 2004
Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Amit K. Ray
Group Art Unit: 2623
Attorney Docket: 27615

should provide a node of the WAN, contrary to the requirement of the claim as amended.

In Fig. 4A of Connelly, the teaching is clearly that the return signal goes through telco network 113A at the bottom of the figure and not through the external receiver installation 136, 138. Fig. 4B uses cables so no wireless network is involved. Fig. 4C uses the Internet so there is neither a terrestrial wireless network nor an external receiver installation.

For the above reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Equivalent amendments have been made to claim 10, which is believed to be allowable for the same reasons.

The dependent claims are believed to be allowable as based on an allowable main claim.

All the matters raised by the Examiner have now been dealt with.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 – 14 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: June 4, 2008

Enclosures:

- Petition for Extension (3 Months)